

Ozone Working Group – January 6, 2004

Meeting Notes

These notes summarize public comments and discussion at the January 6, 2004 Ozone Working Group meeting. Responses to questions that have been provided after the meeting are indicated in *italics*.

Follow-up from October 28 OWG meeting

- Item #3 from Oct 28 meeting notes represents new information that was not discussed at the meeting itself. The same information was announced the next day at Executive Committee meeting. Commenter believes this did not show collaboration.
- Items 22, 26 and 27 – appears that staff did not understand what was being asked. Request for time set aside to discuss.

Time was provided later in the meeting to allow the commenter to elaborate. Believes responses do not show sufficient commitment by MTC and District to emphasize regional issues and solutions. Another Ozone Working Group meeting has been scheduled for January 20, 2004 to allow further public discussion of control measure evaluations.

Status Reports

- Regarding 8-hour standard, how will TCMs be affected due to fact that offending station is in San Martin. Response: Ozone is a regional pollutant. Emissions in one area affect ozone levels elsewhere in the region, and so emission reductions throughout the region are beneficial.
- Will there be voting on Regional Measure 2 in March? Will there be further evaluation of TCMs following vote? Response: Yes.
- Clarify “last 2 measures” to be considered as part of ozone attainment plan (in status report on refinery measures). Response: These are the last 2 remaining measures committed to in the current plan (2001 OAP), SS-16, Low Emission Refinery Valves and SS-17, Improved Process Vessel Depressurization Rule.
- Flare control evaluation – when will draft be ready for public review? Response: Unsure when draft can be ready. More information will be given as soon as possible. Still looking at overall control measure for flares. May decide to separate into two parts, to allow certain portions to be adopted promptly while other elements undergo further rule development. Air District can adopt rule without control measure being in plan.
- Would be helpful to have explanation of plans for flare control measure. Public would like to know about factors considered. Response: District not yet prepared to provide details, but will not necessarily wait for a new ozone plan before moving forward.

- What will be the nature of the bifurcation of control measure for flares?
Response: Unsure, will depend on further evaluation.

In June, 2003, the District Board adopted Regulation 12, Rule 11: Flare Monitoring at Petroleum Refineries. This rule requires monitoring and flare gas sampling and will produce data that will be used to monitor and quantify flare emissions. However, it may take some time to collect sufficient data to fully characterize a wide range of flaring events. Also, refineries have installed additional compressor capacity to reduce flaring and have increased scrutiny of their flaring events so as to minimize flaring where possible. Consequently, District staff believes that some rule provisions might be able to be implemented before extensive flare gas data are available. Staff are currently considering the potential for control in three operational arenas, flaring from routine gas flows, flaring from planned activities, and flaring from emergency releases. In an effort to characterize the spectrum of possibilities, staff is currently discussing the potential for control options from each of these arenas, and these all will be brought before the technical workgroup for flares for discussion and consideration. Staff is projecting a workshop that will include a regulatory proposal in the 2nd quarter of 2004.

Attainment of National 1-hour ozone standard

- When will last year's monitoring data be QAQC'd? Did any changes occur?
Response: District has completed QAQC process for most of 2003 data and has submitted to EPA. Remaining 2 or 3 months will be submitted soon.
Data through the end of October has been submitted to EPA. That represents the end of the ozone season. Data for November and December will be submitted within 90 days of the end of the quarter.
- How will District show that ozone improvement due to permanent and enforceable reductions? Response: Will look at various factors.
- Where will new motor vehicle emission budget come from? Response: emission inventory for the revised plan.
- If a 1-hr violation occurs next year, what is fallback? Response: Contingency measures would come into play if region is redesignated. If region is not redesignated, then SIP elements suspended under a finding of attainment become required elements.
- Region is not eligible for redesignation because not all SIP commitments have been implemented (TCM2). Response: TCM2 may be substituted. EPA could take action on all items at once.
- There is disagreement as to legal status and definition of TCM2. Commenter wants to clarify that TCM2 is a transit measure.
- What has happened in terms of 1-hour standard attainment status? Response – Region was in non-attainment for many years. Redesignated to attainment in

1995. Several exceedences in 1995 and 1996 led to redesignation back to nonattainment in 1998. The region now has an attainment record, but has not yet been redesignated to attainment.

- TRANSDEF thinks District heading in wrong direction with maintenance plan. Irresponsible not to pay attention to all modeling and efforts that have gone into planning process. District in its entire history has never demonstrated attainment. By going to a maintenance plan, District again avoids demonstration, after spending more than a million dollars on modeling. This is not health protective.

Bay Area was in attainment of national 1-hour ozone standard from 1990 – 1994 and is in attainment in 2001 – 2003. Photochemical modeling work continues to move forward.

Control measure evaluations

- Has MTC established cutoff point for VOC and NO_x in grams per mile for light duty vehicles, and compared it to buses, to find break-even point? How many people need to ride a bus in order to have lower emissions than if same people were using cars? Could help planning agencies if information was supplied for both diesel bus and natural gas. Response: Hasn't been calculated, but data is available.
- Agree previous comment is important information. Transit measures should focus on emission reductions rather than farebox recovery.
- Item 22 from Oct. 28 meeting notes: Response shows failure to look at issues from regional perspective. Efforts of different regional agencies don't add up to large enough impact. Should use regional approaches of agencies like ABAG and MTC to develop regional approach. Also true for Items 25, 26 and 27.
- How to do this? Condition funding. Provide incentives for communities to implement measures. Tie regional funding (by MTC) to implementation by cities. Response: Conditioning of funding is discussed in MTC's evaluations. Unfortunately, a small percentage of total RTP funds are appropriate for conditioning, primarily STP and CMAQ. MTC's funding mechanism is a weak lever. Large percentage of funds goes to transit, road improvements and other programs that MTC doesn't control.
- Should look at other possible funding programs. Some greater portion of future funding should be available for local jurisdictions, and be made contingent upon implementing TCMs. Response: Will try to make information on appropriate funding sources available in future.
- Would be beneficial if MTC would emphasize air quality benefits of certain local sales tax programs and transportation expenditures.
- District has done good job of putting together potential control measures. Encourage Use of Synthetic Motor Oil is listed under Potentially Viable Measures, while Education Program on How to Properly Maintain Older

Vehicles is listed under Measures Needing Funding. These two measures are very similar. Recommend they be combined and listed under Potentially Viable Measures.

- Is District addressing which NO_x and which VOC's should be targeted for reduction? Response: District has looked at reactivity of different species of VOC. Good deal of research exists on this matter, and potential exists to develop new control measures accordingly.
- WTA studied diesel and natural gas and found that they were roughly equal in emissions.
- Page 3 of 39 of control measure evaluations – To what degree are certain measures implemented? Some measures don't seem to be fully implemented (e.g., hybrid bus fleet, hybrid vehicles, reduced particulate emissions, HOV lanes on Bay Bridge, Weekend Spare the Air). Should be added to Needs Funding list rather than Already Implemented list. Descriptions are cryptic. Should use web for providing more detailed information. Response: For any measure of interest, District staff person who analyzed it could discuss the evaluation at this meeting or another time.
- Add to list: HOV lane on Bay Bridge.
- Question regarding Expansion of Hybrid Bus Fleet measure: does data exist on number of converted vehicles? Could provide more information on measures such as what efforts have been previously undertaken and what additional implementation steps could be taken. This more detailed information could be provided on the web, indicating the status of the measures. If a measure is in Already Implemented, would be helpful to know more. Would like District to use its judgment to make recommendation as to which measures are "low hanging fruit" and should be implemented first.
- Seems that District is currently acting on some of the Potentially Viable measures. Response: District is proceeding with rulemaking or studying potential rule revisions for various sources. Some of the control measure titles and descriptions in the evaluation table refer to previous ozone plans and District rules because similar measures were proposed in previous plans. In some cases the District is proceeding pursuant to the previous plans and/or is reexamining previous control measure suggestions.
- Is use of commuter checks as incentive for transit use already in a suggested measure? If new development is not currently providing this incentive, could be included in control measure, especially at worksites without parking charges. Response: Commuter Check and other transit incentives are included in current 2000 CAP TCMs, but further incentives could be examined.
- Listing of various Spare the Air measures under more than one heading is confusing. Response: Multiple listings reflect multiple suggestions. Some promising suggestions are included in Potentially Viable, while others are already part of the STA program or are not viable.

- What will happen to measures considered not cost-effective? Response: In the next planning effort, will re-examine these measure for cost-effectiveness, since this may change over time.
- Restriction of pleasure craft – include recreational flying.
- Bio-diesel is being used in San Francisco. If considered a clean fuel, should be given emission reduction credits. Response: ARB has not certified bio-diesel as alternative fuel. District periodically checks on status.
- WTA studied bio-diesel – showed that it increased NOx emissions and decreased particulates.
- Has District looked at reversing toll on Bay Bridge? This may change congestion to the evening and minimize ozone if emissions occurred in eastbound direction. In addition, casual carpool use does not necessarily include a trip in the reverse direction. Response: This would present various operational challenges, and capacity constraints on bridge make continued morning congestion likely even without tolls.
- It would be useful if documents had numbered control measures.

Control measure numbers have been added to the evaluation tables.

- Supports carsharing, location efficient mortgages, smart growth, transit use incentives.
- Parking cash-out is different from parking charges. Proposing that employees who receive free parking could receive cash instead. However, commenter does mean to suggest parking charges for BART.
- Would like table of cost-effectiveness of TCM's compared to Sacramento measures, to help validate figures. Would like to see real-world cross check. Concern that assumptions are too conservative. Response: Sacramento evaluations used heroic assumptions. Numbers based on completely different assumptions, making comparison meaningless. MTC made assumptions clear in evaluations.
- Suggestion that reduction per dollar be calculated and provided, but the comparison can be made between Sacramento and Bay Area by those interested.
- Useful website (WTA website under "public documents") with information all bus fleets, technologies and other information.

<http://www.watertransit.org/publications.shtml>

Please provide comments on control measure evaluations to Henry Hilken at BAAQMD by Friday January 23rd.

Next meeting scheduled for March 23rd, at 9:30, at MetroCenter (here).

An additional meeting was scheduled for Tuesday, January 20, 9 – 11, to allow further discussion of the control measure evaluations